

Transforming Manner Adverbs into Subject-Oriented Adverbs: An evidence from Japanese

Keywords: Adverbs, Comparison class, Manner, Subject-oriented, Japanese

It is known that there is a class of adverbs such as *stupidly* and *rudely* that has different interpretation depending on position in the sentence (Ernst 2002, Jackendoff 1972, Piñón 2010, Rawlins 2008). While (1-a) is ambiguous between manner and clausal readings as in (1-a), disambiguation is possible by different word orders, as in (1-b) and (1-c).

- (1) a. John stupidly danced. (manner/clausal)
- b. John danced stupidly. (manner only)
- c. Stupidly, John danced. (clausal only)

Ernst (2002) takes the clausal one as a default of those subject-oriented adverbs. Rawlins (2008), in analyzing *illegally*, also takes the clausal one as the basic and derive the other reading via type-shifting. In this work, based on Japanese manner/clausal alternation, I explore the opposite direction: going from manner to subject-oriented adverbs.

In Japanese, there is no clausal/manner ambiguity of adjectival adverbials like ‘stupidly’. Regardless of the word order, *orokani*, an adverb derived from the adjective *orokana* ‘stupid’, is interpreted as a manner adverb and *orokani-mo* as a clausal adverb.

- (2) a. John-wa orokani odotta.
 John-TOP stupidly danced.
 ‘John danced stupidly.’
- b. Orokani John-wa odotta.
 stupidly John-TOP danced.
 ‘John danced stupidly.’
- (3) a. John-wa orokani-mo odotta.
 John-TOP stupidly danced.
 ‘Stupidly, John danced.’
- b. Orokani-mo John-wa odotta.
 stupidly John-TOP danced.
 ‘Stupidly, John danced.’

Morphologically, it seems as if the *mo* particle, whatever that is, transforms the manner adjectival adverb into the clausal counterpart. This occurs systematically among adverbs such as *kashikoku(-mo)* ‘cleverly’, *daitanni(-mo)* ‘boldly’, *namaikini(-mo)* ‘impertinently’ etc.

According to Ernst (2002), subject-oriented adverbs take two arguments, i.e. an event and an individual (typically, the agent), and denote the clausal version of the meaning by default. The manner meaning comes about via Manner Rule. This rule applies when the adverb is adjoined lower (somewhere within *vP*). Roughly, as an effect, the comparison class for ‘stupid’ is narrowed down to a kind of dancing events (Specified Events) (4-b), whereas in the original (clausal) version, the comparison class is not limited to dancing but includes various other things that could have happened instead of dancing (4-a).

- (4) a. e warrants positing more stupidity in Agent than the norm for events. (Clausal)
- b. e manifests more stupidity in Agent than the norm for Specified Events. (Manner)

In light of this analysis, what the data (2)-(3) indicates is this: Manner Rule must apply for adverbs without *mo*, and it must not when the adverb has *mo*. Suppose that *orokani* must be adjoined to a VP (i.e. an adverb that selects a VP), thus inviting Manner Rule to apply (obligatorily), whereas *orokani-mo* must not be adjoined to VP, but to a slightly higher position, and preventing Manner Rule to apply. However, this means that *orokani*

cannot be interpreted without the help of Manner Rule unless *mo*-attachment takes place.

Instead, I would like to propose that subject-oriented adverbs in Japanese are derived from manner adverbs. The manner adverb *orokani* adjoins to a VP ($\lambda e. \text{dancing}(e)$) and denotes that the event is considered stupid with respect to the comparison class C which consists of various dancing events.

- (5) $\llbracket \text{orokani} \rrbracket = \lambda V_{\langle v,t \rangle} \lambda e. V(e) \wedge \text{stupid}_C(e)$
 ($\text{stupid}_C(e)$ reads ‘the degree of stupidity that e shows exceeds the standard stupidity, where the standard is determined by the comparison class C that consists of various V -ing’)
- (6) $\llbracket \text{orokani-mo} \rrbracket = \lambda W_{\langle e,vt \rangle} \lambda x \lambda e. \exists C' [C \subset C' \wedge W(x)(e) \wedge \text{stupid}_{C'}(e)]$

The subject-oriented adverb *orokani-mo*, on the other hand, adjoins to a slightly higher position, possibly to a v' level, and denotes that the event is stupid with respect to the comparison class C' that consists of x ’s engaging in various events including dancing.

What is *mo* doing then? Following Ernst’s idea about the comparison class, I suggest that it operates on the comparison class that the adverb is associated with and basically widens the domain of comparison class to include not just the specific kind of event (e.g. dancing) but also all other kinds of events that could have happened (e.g. dancing, drinking, talking etc.) in order to determine if the event is stupid.

- (7) $\llbracket \text{mo} \rrbracket = \lambda A_{\langle vt,vt \rangle} \lambda W_{\langle e,vt \rangle} \lambda x \lambda e. \exists C' [C \subset C' \wedge (\lambda C. A_C(W(x)))(C')(e)]$

The way it is represented in (5)-(6) suggests that in both cases, manner and clausal readings, there is no explicit mentioning of the subject to be stupid, but rather the event (of the subject doing it) is stupid. This seems to lose the insight that, as the term ‘subject-oriented’ indicates, there is a direct connection between the adverb and subject. However, as far as Japanese data is concerned, leaving the connection rather weak (i.e. not letting *mo* to create strictly ‘subject’-oriented adverbs) may be adequate, since the meaning alternation by *mo*-attachment is not limited to subject-oriented adverbs but it is also observed in a sub-class of speaker-oriented adverbs, namely so-called evaluative adverbs, such as *kimyooni*(-*mo*) ‘oddly’, *mezurashiku*(-*mo*) ‘uncommonly’, *fukooni*(-*mo*) ‘unfortunately’. As shown in (8), it is not the case that the subject or the speaker is unfortunate but rather the event (or the fact) that a typhoon hit the island was an unfortunate thing to happen.

- (8) Fukooni-mo taifuu-ga shima-o chokugeki-shita.
 Unfortunately typhoon-NOM island-ACC direct.hit-did
 ‘Unfortunately, a typhoon hit the island.’

The idea of deriving ‘higher’ adverbs from their ‘lower’ counterparts will shed light on the diversity and universality of meaning alternation and classification of adverbs in general. For example, one relevant case may be on so-called pure manner adverbs such as *loudly*. There are in fact many manner adverbs that resists *mo*-attachment, e.g. *doodooto*(*-*mo*) ‘dignifiedly’, *karugaruto*(*-*mo*) ‘lightly’, *urusaku*(*-*mo*) ‘loudly’, *shizukani*(*-*mo*) ‘quietly’. While the first two may be ruled out by a morpho-syntactic rule that prevents *mo* to attach to adverbs that are not derived from an adjective (i.e. those that do not have the adjective counterpart), the latter two may call for a semantic explanation. In spirit of Ernst (2002), which I followed here, what becomes crucial then in explaining the limitation seems to rest on how exactly the comparison class plays a role in the theory.

SELECTED REFERENCES: Ernst, T. 2002. *The Syntax of Adjuncts*. Cambridge University Press. Jackendoff, R. 1972. *Semantic Interpretation in Generative Grammar*. MIT Press. Piñón, C. 2010. ‘What to do with agent-oriented adverbs’. Rawlins, K. 2008. ‘Unifying *Illegally*. Event Structures in Linguistic Form and Interpretation, Mouton de Gruyter.